

REMARKS

[0003] Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and allowance of all of the claims of the application. Claims 1, 3-25, 27-49, and 51-65 are presently pending. Claim 25 is amended herein. No claims are withdrawn, canceled, or are added herein.

Claim Amendments

[0004] Without conceding the propriety of the rejections herein and in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicant amends claim 25 herein. Applicant amends this claim to clarify claimed features. Such amendments are made to expedite prosecution and more quickly identify allowable subject matter. Such amendments are merely intended to clarify the claimed features, and should not be construed as further limiting the claimed invention in response to the cited references.

Substantive Matters

Claim Rejections under § 103

[0005] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 3-25, 27-49, and 51-65 under § 103. For the reasons set forth below, the Examiner has not made a prima facie case showing that the rejected claims are obvious.

[0006] Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the § 103 rejections be withdrawn and the case be passed along to issuance.

[0007] The Examiner's rejections are based upon the following references alone in combination:

- **Hilbert:** *Hilbert*, US Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0088570 (Published May 8, 2003);
- **Enin:** *Enin, Batch Launcher 1.0*, retrieved on 02/28/2007, at <<[http://www.simtel.net/product.php\[id\]62501\[cid\]301\[SiteID\]simtel.net](http://www.simtel.net/product.php[id]62501[cid]301[SiteID]simtel.net)>>, GadgetCity, 2006, pp 1-3;
- **Langer:** *Langer, Visual QuickStart Guide Mac OS X 10.1*, Maria Langer, 2002, pp 5;
- **Rathbone:** *Rathbone, Windows XP for Dummies*, 2001, Wiley Publishing, Inc., pp 17;
- **Ricart:** *Ricart, The Complete Idiot's Guide to Linux*, Second Edition, 2000, Que Corporation; and
- **Grebler:** *Grebler, Windows Fast & Easy*, 2003, Course Technology PTR.

Obviousness Rejections

Lack of *Prima Facie* Case of Obviousness (MPEP § 2142)

[0008] Applicant disagrees with the Examiner's obviousness rejections. Arguments presented herein point to various aspects of the record to demonstrate that all of the criteria set forth for making a prima facie case have not been met.

Based upon Hilbert

[0009] The Examiner rejects claims 1, 6-8, 10-12, 14-19, 21, 23-25, 31-32, 34-36, 38-43, 45, 47-49, 54-56, 58-63, 65 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hilbert in view of Enin. Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection of these claims and asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of these claims.

Independent Claim 1

[0010] Applicant submits that the combination of Hilbert and Enin is both improper and does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- "A user interface for depiction by a display ***of a computing system***, the user interface for enhancing a computing session by providing seamless continuity when a user logs onto the computing system, the user interface comprising:"
- "a logon page which is displayed to the user prior to logging onto the computing system, ***the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user***, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with ***a selectable logon control on the logon page***"

[0011] The Examiner indicates (Action, pp. 2-4) the following with regard to this claim:

Claim 1, 25, 48, 49: Hilbert discloses a user interface for enhancing a computing session by providing seamless continuity when a user logs onto the computing system, the user interface comprising:

- a. a logon page which is displayed to the user prior to logging onto the computing system, the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator ("Toru", Fig. 3) corresponding to the user, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with a selectable logon control on the logon page (Fig. 3, par 74); and
- b. a user interface start page (Fig. 5: 500) displayed in response to user selection of the selectable logon control via the logon page, (Fig. 3-4-5)
- c. the user interface start page displayed to the user after a first transition (Fig. 3-4-5) from the logon page but prior to a second transition to a desktop page (Fig. 5-9),
- d. wherein the user interface start page (Fig. 5: 500) and the desktop page (Fig. 9) each include the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user (Fig. 5: 520, Fig. 9, "Toru").
- e. wherein the user-identifiable indicator is displayed uninterrupted throughout the first transition (Fig. 3-4-5) and throughout the second transition (Fig. 5-9), and
- f. wherein the user interface start page further includes user selectable controls (Fig. 5: 540, information categories; par. 77) from one or more regions (par. 77: "additional screen and pages", e.g. Fig. 9) of the desktop page (Fig. 9; par. 77-79) which is displayed after the second transition,
- g. each of the user selectable controls configured to initiate a display of information associated with the user when selected (par. 77-79); and

However, Hilbert does not explicitly disclose:

- h. wherein the user interface start page further comprises a start control that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple application programs start together at approximately a same time after the transition to the desktop and after a single user input.

Enin discloses a Batch Launcher application for use on an operating system, including a

- l. a start control that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple application programs start together at approximately a same time after the transition to the desktop and after a single user input (pg. 1-2.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include controls for multiple application initiation as taught by Enin within the confines of Hilbert. One would have been motivated to include the teaching of Enin in Hilbert as Enin is an application for Windows NT (par. 87) so as to compliment the launching of directories of recent documents of Hilbert.

[0012] At the outset, Applicant notes that the rejection relies upon teachings from a web page hosted by Simtel.net which describes a batch launcher application (Enin) having a release date of Feb 10, 2003. Applicant notes, however, that what appears in the web page hosted by Simtel.net does not appear until Feb 28, 2007, which is more than 3 years after the filing date of the instant application. Therefore, any teaching about Batch Launcher 1.0 found within the web page is immaterial to the application as it does not constitute prior art.

[0013] Therefore, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness for the claimed "a start control that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple application programs start together at approximately a same time after the transition to the desktop page and after a single user input" as this feature is not found in any cited *prior art* reference.

[0014] Furthermore, what is claimed is "a user interface... of a computing system". Conversely, Hilbert teaches a "personal portal for a multi-user document device."

[0015] Hilbert explicitly teaches that his "personal portal" is for a "multi-user document device" (0010) and discloses that a "multi-user document device" is distinguishable from a computing system as can be seen from the following:

"As used throughout this specification, multi-user document devices include copiers, printers, scanners, facsimile machines, combinations

thereof or similar known or hereafter developed devices, **as opposed to a computer device** such as a personal computer, a PDA or the like.” (Para. 0049, emphasis added).

[0016] Therefore, Applicant submits that the “personal portal” disclosed by Hilbert has no pertinence to the claimed subject matter as would be recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art.

[0017] It is for this reason that Batch Launcher 1.0, even as disclosed by Simtel.net, would not be combinable with Hilbert, as there is no teaching that would suggest that Batch Launcher 1.0 would even operate on a device such as printer or scanner. Even the Simtel.net web page (albeit immaterial) discloses that it requires some version of the “Windows” operating system.

[0018] Furthermore, Hilbert does not teach the claimed “logon page including a user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with a **selectable logon control** on the logon page” as asserted by the Examiner.

[0019] For this claimed feature, the rejection relies upon Hilbert Figure 3 and teachings from paragraph 0074. Figure 3, however, does not show “a selectable logon control on [a] logon page”. Figure 3 shows an “electronic tag” being sensed by a user identification device (0074). Hilbert discloses that the “electronic tag” may be “a magnetically encoded card”, “a credit card”, or “a smart card” (0074).

[0020] Applicant submits that an electronic tag or card is not a selectable logon control, as one of ordinary skill in the art would be familiar. Furthermore, while the card is shown overlaid of what could loosely be characterized as a logon “page” the page itself has no “user identifiable indicator associated” with the card. It is depicted only as including “Sensing ID...”.

[0021] Furthermore, paragraph 0074 does not include teachings which would otherwise account for the claimed feature. It discloses only certain “various embodiments” by which a user may be identified by the interface.

[0022] These certain “various embodiments” are limited to “a key entry... such as a login and/or a password” the sensing of an “electronic tag” as shown in Figure 3, Figure 4, and Figure 5 (element 520) and “biometric measurements” as disclosed in paragraph 0075.

[0023] In paragraph 0075, Hilbert further discloses that the “biometric measurements” may include such things as “fingerprints”, “retina scans”, “voiceprints”, and “electronic signatures”. None of these “various embodiments” are equivalent to the claimed “selectable logon control” as claimed, and none could be fairly said to be “on [a] logon page” as claimed, save for the “key entry”. Again, what is specifically claimed is

“a logon page which is displayed to the user prior to logging onto the computing system, the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with a selectable logon control on the logon page;”

[0024] As shown above, the combination of Hilbert and Enin does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Also, teachings about Enin as found at Simtel.net does not qualify as prior art. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 3-24

[0025] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 1. As discussed above, claim 1 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim, which depends from an allowable base claim, is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 25

[0026] Applicant submits that the combination of Hilbert and Enin is both improper and does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- ***“A method for*** providing seamless continuity when a user logs onto ***a computing system,*** the method comprising”
- “displaying, on a display device, a logon page to the user, the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with a selectable logon control on the logon page”
- “displaying a user interface start page in response to user selection of the selectable logon control via the logon page, the user interface start page displayed to the user after a first transition from the logon page but prior to ***a second transition to a desktop page,*** wherein the user interface start page and the desktop page each include the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user, and ***wherein the user-identifiable indicator is displayed uninterrupted*** throughout the first transition ***and throughout the second transition***”

[0027] The Examiner indicates (Action, pp. 2-4) the following with regard to this claim:

Claim 1, 25, 48, 49: Hilbert discloses a user interface for enhancing a computing session by providing seamless continuity when a user logs onto the computing system, the user interface comprising:

- a. a logon page which is displayed to the user prior to logging onto the computing system, the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator ("Toru", Fig. 3) corresponding to the user, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with a selectable logon control on the logon page (Fig. 3, par 74); and
- b. a user interface start page (Fig. 5: 500) displayed in response to user selection of the selectable logon control via the logon page, (Fig. 3-4-5)
- c. the user interface start page displayed to the user after a first transition (Fig. 3-4-5) from the logon page but prior to a second transition to a desktop page (Fig. 5-9),
- d. wherein the user interface start page (Fig. 5: 500) and the desktop page (Fig. 9) each include the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user (Fig. 5: 520, Fig. 9, "Toru"),
- e. wherein the user-identifiable indicator is displayed uninterrupted throughout the first transition (Fig. 3-4-5) and throughout the second transition (Fig. 5-9) , and
- f. wherein the user interface start page further includes user selectable controls (Fig. 5: 540, information categories; par. 77) from one or more regions (par. 77: "additional screen and pages", e.g. Fig. 9) of the desktop page (Fig. 8; par. 77-79) which is displayed after the second transition,
- g. each of the user selectable controls configured to initiate a display of information associated with the user when selected (par. 77-79); and

However, Hilbert does not explicitly disclose:

- h. wherein the user interface start page further comprises a start control that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple application programs start together at approximately a same time after the transition to the desktop and after a single user input.

Enin discloses a Batch Launcher application for use on an operating system, including a

- i. a start control that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple application programs start together at approximately a same time after the transition to the desktop and after a single user input (pg. 1-2.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include controls for multiple application initiation as taught by Enin within the confines of Hilbert. One would have been motivated to include the teaching of Enin in Hilbert as Enin is an application for Windows NT (par. 87) so as to compliment the launching of directories of recent documents of Hilbert.

[0028] Applicant reiterates all of the arguments made for claim 1 here with respect to independent claim 25 with the following modification and additions.

[0029] Firstly, independent claim 25 is to “a method for providing seamless continuity when a user logs onto a computing system”, and while independent claim 25 is to a method as opposed to the interface of claim 1, Hilbert is still impertinent to the claim for the reasons noted with respect to claim 1.

[0030] In addition, Applicant submits that Hilbert does not show the claimed “wherein the user-identifiable indicator is displayed uninterrupted throughout the first transition and throughout the second transition”.

[0031] As established for claim 1, Hilbert does not teach “[a] logon page including a user-identifiable indicator” as Figure 3 at best shows only “Sensing ID...” appearing on a user interface.

[0032] As can be seen from the rejection, the Examiner asserts that “Toru” is a user identifiable indicator which appears uninterrupted throughout both the first and second transitions, citing to figures 5-9. However, “Toru” does not appear at all in Figure 6. Hilbert describes Figure 6 as illustrating “desktop related items”. Therefore, Hilbert does not teach or suggest “*a second transition to a desktop page... wherein the user-identifiable indicator is displayed uninterrupted... throughout the second transition*” as claimed. Applicant notes that while this argument is made for independent claim 25 it is pertinent to claim 1 as well.

[0033] As shown above, the combination of Hilbert and Enin does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Also, teachings about Enin at Simtel.net do not qualify as prior art. Therefore, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness for this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 27-48

[0034] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 25. As discussed above, claim 25 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim, which depends from an allowable base claim, is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Independent Claim 49

[0035] Applicant submits that the combination of Hilbert and Enin is both improper and does not teach or suggest at least the following features as recited in this claim (with emphasis added):

- "One or more computer readable media comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, **direct a computing device to:**"
- "display a logon page to the user, **the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user**, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with **a selectable logon control on the logon page**"
- "display a user interface start page in response to user selection of the selectable logon control via the logon page, the user interface start page displayed to the user after a first transition from the logon page but prior to a **second transition to a desktop page**, wherein the user interface start page and the desktop page each include the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user, and **wherein the user-identifiable indicator is**

displayed uninterrupted throughout the first transition and ***throughout the second transition***"

[0036] The Examiner indicates (Action, pp. 2-4) the following with regard to this claim:

Claim 1, 25, 48, 49: Hilbert discloses a user interface for enhancing a computing session by providing seamless continuity when a user logs onto the computing system, the user interface comprising:

- a. a logon page which is displayed to the user prior to logging onto the computing system, the logon page including a user-identifiable indicator ("Toru", Fig. 3) corresponding to the user, wherein the user-identifiable indicator is associated with a selectable logon control on the logon page (Fig. 3, par 74); and
- b. a user interface start page (Fig. 5: 500) displayed in response to user selection of the selectable logon control via the logon page, (Fig. 3-4-5)

- c. the user interface start page displayed to the user after a first transition (Fig. 3-4-5) from the logon page but prior to a second transition to a desktop page (Fig. 5-9),
- d. wherein the user interface start page (Fig. 5: 500) and the desktop page (Fig. 9) each include the user-identifiable indicator corresponding to the user (Fig. 5: 520, Fig. 9, "Toru"),
- e. wherein the user-identifiable indicator is displayed uninterrupted throughout the first transition (Fig. 3-4-5) and throughout the second transition (Fig. 5-9), and
- f. wherein the user interface start page further includes user selectable controls (Fig. 5: 540, information categories; par. 77) from one or more regions (par. 77: "additional screen and pages", e.g. Fig. 9) of the desktop page (Fig. 9; par. 77-79) which is displayed after the second transition,
- g. each of the user selectable controls configured to initiate a display of information associated with the user when selected (par. 77-79); and

However, Hilbert does not explicitly disclose:

- h. wherein the user interface start page further comprises a start control that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple application programs start together at approximately a same time after the transition to the desktop and after a single user input.

Enin discloses a Batch Launcher application for use on an operating system, including a

- i. a start control that is user-selectable to initiate that multiple application programs start together at approximately a same time after the transition to the desktop and after a single user input (pg. 1-2.)

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include controls for multiple application initiation as taught by Enin within the confines of Hilbert. One would have been motivated to include the teaching of Enin in Hilbert as Enin is an application for Windows NT (par. 87) so as to compliment the launching of directories of recent documents of Hilbert.

[0037] Here Applicant reiterates all of the arguments made with regard to claim 1 and independent claim 25 with the following modification.

[0038] Independent claim 49 is to “one or more computer readable media comprising computer executable instructions that, when executed, ***direct a computing device***”, and while this claim is to one or more computer readable media as opposed to the interface of claim 1, or the method of claim 25, Hilbert is still impertinent to the claim for the reasons noted with respect to claim 1.

[0039] As shown above, the combination of Hilbert and Enin does not teach or suggest all of the elements and features of this claim. Also, teachings about Enin at Simtel.net do not qualify as prior art. Therefore, the Examiner has not established a prima facie case of obviousness for this claim. Accordingly, Applicant asks the Examiner to withdraw the rejection of this claim.

Dependent Claims 51-65

[0040] These claims ultimately depend upon independent claim 49. As discussed above, claim 49 is allowable. It is axiomatic that any dependent claim, which depends from an allowable base claim, is also allowable. Additionally, some or all of these claims may also be allowable for additional independent reasons.

Dependent Claims

[0041] In addition to its own merits, each dependent claim is allowable for the same reasons that its base claim is allowable. Applicant requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejection of each dependent claim where its base claim is allowable.

Conclusion

[0042] In light of the forgoing amendments and remarks, early reconsideration and allowance of this application are most courteously solicited. Should the Examiner feel that a personal discussion might be helpful in advancing this case to allowance, they are invited to telephone or e-mail the undersigned.

[0043] In addition, it is believed that all of the pending claims have been fully addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue, or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue, or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed, such as the validity of combining references.

[0044] Finally, nothing in this communication should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this communication, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Respectfully Submitted,

Lee & Hayes, PLLC
Representatives for Applicant

/Randall T. Palmer 61440/ Dated: 04/06/09

Randall T. Palmer (randy@leehayes.com; x4761)

Registration No. 61440

Rob Peck (robp@leehayes.com; x6019)

Registration No. 56826

Customer No. 22801

Telephone: (509) 324-9256

Facsimile: (509) 323-8979

www.leehayes.com